SK

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/247,125	02/08/1999	ANTONY S. WILLIAMS		7260

7590 05/21/2003

STEPHEN A. WIGHT
KLARQUIST SPARKMAN CAMPBELL
LEIGH & WHINSTON, LLP
SUITE 1600 121 SW SALMON STREET
PORTLAND, OR 972042988

EXAMINER	
CALDWELL, ANDREW T	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2157	21

DATE MAILED: 05/21/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SK

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/247,125	WILLIAMS, ANTONY S.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew Caldwell	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *04 March 2003* .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *27-49,71-79 and 81-89* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *27-49,71-79 and 81-89* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

II. Detailed Action

Remarks

Claims 27-49, 71-79, and 81-89 are pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 27, 30-34, 49, 71-72, 74-79, and 81-89 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khoyi et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,261,080.

Regarding claim 71, the preamble will be given patentable weight since the claim body refers back to the preamble. See the client and the application programming interface at line 6. Khoyi teaches the invention substantially as claimed by disclosing:

A computer system for manipulating an object displayable in a client application via a of server application using an application programming interface (Fig. 9 elem. 240-d as client; elem. 240-s as server; elem. 232-d as object displayable in client);

The computer system having a configuration store for storing a class identifier associated with the object and associating the class identifier with the server application (col. 35 line 27 to col. 36 line 4);

Wherein the system practices a method comprising:

Requesting by the client application (Fig. 9 elem. 240-d) through the application programming interface a manipulation to be performed on the object (col. 3 lines 25-30; col. 34 lines 41-60), wherein the routines of the API are divided into an object independent client library and a server library, the object independent client library comprising routines which invoke the proper server application to manipulate the object, and the server library comprising routines which process requests to manipulate the object (Fig. 9 elem. 218 as client library with a separate instance of Fig. 9 elem. 218 running on a separate machine as the server library when the server program runs on a separate machine per col. 22 lines 53-59);

Determining by the object independent client library using the configuration store and the class identifier of the object, a server application to perform the requested manipulation on the object (col. 3 lines 16-30; col. 26 lines 25-63 object type as class identifier; col. 35 line 27 to col. 36 line 4);

Sending by the object independent client library, a message to the server library to perform the requested manipulation on the object (col. 3 lines 25-30; col. 34 lines 41-60);

Invoking by the server library the server application to perform the requested manipulation on the object (col. 3 lines 25-30; col. 34 lines 41-60).

Khoyi does not explicitly describe a system in which a server out of a plurality of servers is determined to perform the requested manipulation on the object. In other words, Khoyi describes an embodiment where a particular object type/class id is mapped to a single server as discussed above.

Khoyi does however teach that that it is not limited to a one to one mapping between object type/class id and the corresponding object manager/server. In particular, Khoyi teaches that multiple object managers may operate with any given object type (Col. 10 lines 14-18).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Khoyi to include a one to many mapping between object type and object managers based on Khoyi's explicit suggestion to do so (col. 10 lines 14-18). The system as modified therefore teaches a system in which a server out of a plurality of servers is determined to perform the requested manipulation on the object since the system would have to resolve the one to many mapping.

Regarding claim 72, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the object displayable in the client application is a first object, and the method further comprising depicting the first object as appearing inside a second object displayable in the client application (col. 2 lines 15-25; col. 15 lines 6-17).

Regarding claim 73, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client determines from the configuration store and displays for a user a list of available manipulations on the object (col. 16 lines 9-22).

Regarding claim 74, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the server application is started up in response to receiving the message (col. 32 lines 27-33).

Regarding claim 75, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the server application shuts down after completion of the manipulations requested in the message (col. 35 lines 5-24).

Regarding claim 76, Khoyi teaches a method wherein a user can select a new object from amongst a plurality of embedded or linked objects displayed in a graphical user interface (col. 34 line 17).

Regarding claim 77, Khoyi teaches a method wherein a user can select a manipulation or procedure to be performed on a selected object from amongst a plurality of manipulations or procedures displayed in a graphical user interface (col. 33 line 26).

Regarding claim 27, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client library determines the server application based on an association with the class identifier (col. 35 lines 27-54).

Regarding claim 30, Khoyi teaches a method including when the server application supports an object that is compatible with the client application, launching the server application (col. 47 lines 44-53).

Regarding claim 31, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client application is executing in a process and the server application is launched in a separate process (col. 32 lines 34-46).

Regarding claim 32, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client application is executing in a process and the server application is launched in the same process (col. 32 lines 27-33).

Regarding claim 33, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client application and the server application exchange data using a compatible format (col. 47 lines 18-51).

Regarding claim 34, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client library determines the association while the server application is not executing (col. 34 lines 37-46).

Regarding claims 49 and 82, they are directed to computer readable media containing instructions for causing a computer system to perform the methods of claim 71 and 27, respectively. Since the information in the media claims does not teach or define above the information in the corresponding method claims, they are rejected under the same basis.

Regarding claim 78, it is a method claim that corresponds to method claim 27 with the additional limitation of allowing the user to edit or otherwise manipulate the linked or embedded object. As to this additional limitation, Khoyi teaches this limitation at col. 33 line 26.

As to claim 79, it is directed to a method where the user is able to edit or manipulate a linked or embedded object by selecting an action available on a client menu. In other words, the user edits or manipulates the object using a graphical user interface. Official notice is hereby taken of the fact that graphical user interfaces are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the

time the invention was made that Khoyi implicitly includes a system wherein objects are manipulated using a graphical user interface given Khoyi's teaching of compound documents including text and pictures (col. 14 lines 11-35).

Regarding claim 81, it is an apparatus claim written in means plus function form that performs the method of claim 27. Since the information in the apparatus claim does not teach or define above the information in the corresponding method claim, it is rejected under the same basis.

Regarding claim 83, it is media claim corresponding to method claim 78. Since the information in the media claim does not teach or define above the information in the corresponding method claim, it is rejected under the same basis.

Regarding claim 84, Khoyi teaches a method further comprising:

Receiving by the server library, an indication from the server application that the requested manipulation is complete (col. 67 lines 4-18);

Sending a message from the server library that the requested manipulation is complete (col. 67 lines 4-18);

Receiving by the client library, the message from the server library that the requested manipulation is complete (col. 67 lines 4-18);

Sending an indication to the client application that the requested manipulation is complete (col. 67 lines 4-18).

Regarding claim 85, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client application and the client library are dynamically linked to execute in the same process (col. 14 lines 41-45).

Regarding claim 86, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the server application and the server library are dynamically linked to execute in the same process (col. 14 lines 41-45).

Regarding claim 87, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client library and the server library send messages via a channel comprising inter-process communication (col. 14 lines 54-57).

Regarding claim 88, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client application, the client library, the server application, and the server library are processes sharing the same processor (col. 14 lines 41-45).

Regarding claim 89, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the API provides functions comprising compound document functionality (col. 14 lines 11-35).

Claims 28-29 and 35-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khoyi in view of Travis, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,280,610.

Regarding claim 28, Khoyi teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See the rejection of claim 27 above. Khoyi does not teach the additional limitation of claim 28. Travis on the other hand teaches a method wherein the association is recorded during installation of the server application (col. 24 lines 13-24). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Travis's teaching regarding the registration of servers with the system of Khoyi because

it allows for extending the system to include new applications as suggested by Khoyi (col. 4 lines 31-36).

Regarding claim 29, Khoyi teaches the invention substantially as claimed. See the rejection of claim 27 above. Khoyi does not teach the additional limitation of claim 28. Travis on the other hand teaches a method wherein the association is recorded when the server application is launched (col. 24 lines 40-55). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Travis's teaching regarding the registration of servers with the system of Khoyi because it allows for extending the system to include new applications as suggested by Khoyi (col. 4 lines 31-36).

Regarding claim 35, the remarks given above with respect to claim 29 apply equally to claim 35.

Regarding claim 36, Khoyi teaches a method including when the server application supports a data format that is compatible with the client application, launching the server application (col. 47 lines 44-53).

Regarding claims 37-40, they introduce limitations identical to those addressed above in claims 31-34, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claim 41, the remarks given above with respect to claim 29 apply equally to claim 41.

Regarding claim 42, Khoyi teaches a method wherein the client application determines the association that supports the class identifier while the server application is not executing (col. 34 lines 37-46).

Regarding claim 43, Travis teaches a method wherein the server application populates the configuration store during installation of the server application (col. 24 lines 40-55).

Regarding claim 44, Travis teaches a method wherein the server application populates the configuration store when the server application is launched (col. 24 lines 40-55).

Regarding claim 45, Khoyi teaches a method including when the server application supports a data format that is compatible with the client application, launching the server application (col. 47 lines 44-53).

Regarding claims 46-48, they introduce limitations identical to those addressed above in claims 31-33, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on March 4, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant is arguing in substance that neither Khoyi nor the combination of Khoyi in view of Travis teaches a system in which API routines are divided into an object independent client library and a server library. This argument is not deemed persuasive since Khoyi teaches that a distributed system in which APPACK's run on separate machines (col. 22 lines 53-59). In such a system the APPACK running on the client is independent of the APPACK running on the server. Khoyi therefore teaches an object independent client library and a server library.

The Applicant also argues that neither Khoyi nor the combination of Khoyi in view of Travis teaches a system in which the server library invokes the server application to perform the requested manipulation on the object. This argument is related to the previous argument because it is based on the underlying assumption that the APPACK is limited to a single library running on a single machine, with the result being that the references fail to teach a server library because the APPACK cannot be both. This argument is not deemed persuasive for the reasons given in the preceding paragraph.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Examiner directs the Applicant's attention to the articles discussing OLE in the Microsoft Systems Journal. See Table of Contents for Issues of Microsoft Systems Journal, www.math.utah.edu/ftp/pub/tex/bib/toc/microsys.html, pp. 1-28, May 2003. In particular see page 6 discussing vol. 5 no. 5 and page 7 discussing vol. 7 nos. 2 and 3.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Caldwell, whose telephone number is (703) 306-3036. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m. EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by phone fail, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne, can be reached at (703) 308-7562. Additionally, the fax numbers for Group 2100 are as follows:

Official Responses:	(703) 746-7239
After Final Responses:	(703) 746-7238
Draft Responses:	(703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-9600.

Andrew Caldwell

Andrew Caldwell
703-306-3036
May 18, 2003